

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL MINUTES—
GENERAL

Case No.	8:23-cv-00358-JWH-JDE 2:23-cv-04752-JWH-JDE 5:23-cv-01496-JWH-JDE	Date	November 27, 2023
Title	<i>Robert Hedrick v. BSH Home Appliances Corporation</i> <i>Debra Goldstein v. Whirlpool Corporation</i> <i>Ellyn Norris v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc.</i>		

Present: The Honorable JOHN W. HOLCOMB, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Clarissa Lara
Deputy Clerk

Not Reported
Court Reporter

Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s):
None Present

Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s):
None Present

Proceedings: ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: CONSOLIDATION (IN CHAMBERS)

Plaintiffs Robert Hedrick and Nicholas Kalergis bring a putative class action against Defendant BSH Home Appliances Corporation. The case concerns Plaintiffs' use of a gas stove made by BSH.¹ In a separate case, Plaintiff Debra Goldstein brings a putative class action against Defendant Whirlpool Corporation² that concerns those Plaintiffs' use of a gas stove made by Whirlpool.³ In a third case, Plaintiffs Ellyn Norris and A.J. Stone bring a putative class action against Defendant Samsung Electronics America, Inc.⁴ that, again, concerns those

¹ See generally Second Am. Compl. [ECF No. 36].

² See *Goldstein v. Whirlpool Corporation*, Case No. 2:23-cv-04752-JWH-JDE (C.D. Cal.) (the "*Goldstein Case*").

³ See generally Am. Compl. in the *Goldstein Case* [ECF No. 30].

⁴ See *Norris v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc.*, Case No. 5:23-cv-01496-JWH-JDE (C.D. Cal.) (the "*Norris Case*").

Plaintiffs' use of a gas stove made by Samsung.⁵ All of the named Plaintiffs in those three cases are represented by the same law firm—Dovel & Luner, LLP.

The Court finds that consolidation of those three cases might be appropriate. Indeed, courts often find it appropriate to consolidate cases when those cases include the same parties and share common questions of law and fact. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a); *see also In re Adams Apple, Inc.*, 829 F.2d 1484, 1487 (9th Cir. 1987) (“trial cases may consolidate cases *sua sponte*”). Here, the cases include similar allegations, and the cases share common questions of law.

Accordingly, the Court hereby **ORDERS** as follows:

1. Each party in each of the three cases is **DIRECTED** to show cause why the Court should not consolidate the three cases discussed above. The parties are **DIRECTED** to respond in writing to this Order to Show Cause no later than December 15, 2023.

2. A hearing on this OSC is **SET** for January 5, 2024, at 11:00 a.m. All parties are **DIRECTED** to appear in person at that time in Courtroom 9D of the Ronald Reagan Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse, 411 W. 4th Street, Santa Ana, California.

3. The hearings regarding the Motions to Dismiss filed in these three cases, as set forth below, are all **CONTINUED** to January 5, 2024, at 11:00 a.m.:

a. BSH's Motion to Dismiss the Second Amended Complaint in the *Hedrick* Case [ECF No. 38].

b. Whirlpool Corporation's Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint in the *Goldstein* Case [ECF No. 31].

c. Samsung's Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint in the *Norris* Case [ECF No. 34].

4. The Scheduling Conferences set in these cases are **CONTINUED** to January 5, 2024 at 11:00 a.m.

⁵ *See generally* Am. Compl. in the *Norris* case [ECF No. 30].

5. The prior motions, as set forth below, are all **DENIED as moot** in view of the respective Plaintiffs' amendment of their pleadings:

a. BSH's Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint in the *Hedrick* Case [ECF No. 31].

b. Whirlpool Corporation's Motion to Dismiss the Complaint in the *Goldstein* Case [ECF No. 23].

c. Samsung's Motion to Dismiss the Complaint in the *Norris* Case [ECF No. 21].

IT IS SO ORDERED.